arXiv:1510.05124v3 [math.RT] 20 Feb 2016

MONIC MONOMIAL REPRESENTATIONS I: GORENSTEIN-PROJECTIVE MODULES

XIU-HUA LUO, PU ZHANG*

Abstract. For a k-algebra A, a quiver Q, and an ideal I of kQ generated by monomial relations, let $\Lambda := A \otimes_k kQ/I$. We introduce the monic representations of (Q, I) over A. We give properties of the structural maps of monic representations, and prove that the category $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ of the monic representations of (Q, I) over A is a resolving subcategory of $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$. We introduce the condition (G). The main result claims that a Λ-module is Gorenstein-projective if and only if it is a monic module satisfying (G). As consequences, the monic Λ-modules are exactly the projective Λ-modules if and only if A is semisimple; and they are exactly the Gorenstein-projective Λ-modules if and only if A is selfinjective, and if and only if $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ is Frobenius.

Key words and phrases. monic representations, Gorenstein-projective modules

1. Introduction and reliminaries

1.1. The representation category $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, k)$ of a bounded quiver (Q, I) over field k ([28], [4]), and the morphism category ([3]) of k-algebra A, can be reviewed as the representation category $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ of (Q, I) over A, or equivalently, the module category Λ-mod with $\Lambda := A \otimes_k kQ/I$. If $I = 0$, this viewpoint induces the notion of *monic* Λ-modules ([25]), and we get *the monomorphism category* $\mathrm{mon}(Q, A)$ consisting of monic representations of Q over A.

In fact, there is a long history of studying $\mathrm{mon}(Q, A)$, initiated by G.Birkhoff [7]. When Q is of type A_n, it is *the submodule category* ([29]-[31], [26]) or *the filtered chain category* ([1], [33], [34]). In particular, C.M.Ringel and M.Schmidmeier have established the Auslander-Reiten theory of the submodule category ([30]); and D.Simson have studied the representation type ([33]). A reciprocity of monomorphism operator and perpendicular operator is given ([35]); and by D.Kussin, H.Lenzing and H.Meltzer ([23], [24]) and X.W.Chen [10], the monomorphism category is related to the singularity theory.

However, for $I \neq 0$, how to define monic representations of (Q, I) over A is a problem. In this paper we consider the case that I is generated by monomial relations. Definition 2.1 is inspired by the property of projective kQ/I-modules. This fits our aim of describing Gorenstein-projective Λ-module via monic representations of (Q, I) over A. If A is not semisimple, then the monic representations of (Q, I) over A are much more than the projective Λ-modules. We give properties of the structural maps X_p of a monic representation X (Theorem 2.3). The category $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ of the monic representations of (Q, I) over A is proved to be a resolving subcategory of $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ (Theorem 3.1).

1.2. On the other hand, Gorenstein-projective modules (M.Auslander and M.Bridger [2]; E.E.Enochs and O.M.G.Jenda [13]) enjoy more pleasant stable properties than projective modules (cf. [8], [6], [32], [18]). They form a main ingredient in the relative homological algebra (cf. [14], [5], [17], [11], [20]), and are widely used in the representation theory and algebraic geometry (cf. [8], [22], [9], [16], [6], [12], [19]). An important feature is that the category $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ of Gorenstein-projective modules is Frobenius, and hence

2010 Mathematical Subject Classification. primary 16G10, 16E65; secondary 16G50, 18E30.

* *The corresponding author.*

Supported by the NSFC 11271251, 11431010 and 11401323.

its stable category $\underline{\mathcal{GP}(A)}$ is triangulated. If A is Gorenstein then the singularity category of A is triangle equivalent to $\underline{\mathcal{GP}(A)}$ ([8]), and hence has the Auslander-Reiten triangles ([15]).

Thus we need explicitly construct all the Gorenstein-projective modules of an algebra Λ. This turns out to be closely related to the monomorphism category (cf. [35], [19], [25], [36]). However, if we view an algebra as $\Lambda := A \otimes_k kQ/I$, this relation is only known at the case of $I = 0$ ([25]).

We introduce the condition (G). The main result Theorem 4.1 claims that a Λ-module is Gorenstein-projective if and only if it is a monic representation of (Q, I) over A satisfying the condition (G). Note that here Λ is not necessarily Gorenstein. In this way we give an inductive construction of the Gorenstein-projective Λ-modules via quivers. This generalizes the corresponding result in [25] for $I = 0$, however, the proof of this general case is more complicated, and a main tool is a description of the Gorenstein-projective modules over the triangular extension of two algebras via a bimodule ([36]). So we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\text{projective } \Lambda\text{-module}\} \ &\subseteq \ \{\text{Gorenstein-projective } \Lambda\text{-module}\} \\ &= \ \{\text{monic } \Lambda\text{-module satisfying (G)}\} \subseteq \ \{\text{monic } \Lambda\text{-module}\}.\end{aligned}$$

As applications of Theorem 4.1, the first inclusion is an equality if and only if A is semisimple; and the last inclusion is an equality if and only if A is selfinjective, and if and only if $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ is Frobenius.

1.3. Throughout A is a finite-dimensional algebra over field k, A-mod the category of finitely generated left A-modules, Q a finite acyclic quiver, I an ideal of path algebra kQ generated by monomial relations, and $\Lambda := A \otimes kQ/I$. All tensors $\otimes$ are over k. Let Q_0 and Q_1 be the set of vertices and the set of arrows, respectively, $s(\alpha)$ and $e(\alpha)$ the starting and the ending vertex of arrow α, respectively. Path p is a sequence $\alpha_l \cdots \alpha_1$ of arrows with each $e(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$; and it is *non-zero* if $p \notin I$. Connection of paths is from right to left. Vertex v is a path of length 0, denoted by e_v, and $P(v)$ is the indecomposable projective kQ/I-module $(kQ/I)e_v$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of paths, $s(p)$, $e(p)$ and $l(p)$ the starting vertex, the ending vertex and the length of $p \in \mathcal{P}$, respectively. Label Q_0 as $1, \cdots, n$, such that $j > i$ if $\alpha : j \to i$ is in Q_1. So n is a source and 1 is a sink. If $p = \alpha q \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\alpha \in Q_1$, then α is *the last arrow* of p, denoted by $\mathrm{la}(p) := \alpha$. Let $\rho := \{\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_t\}$ is the minimal set of generators of I. For $i, j \in Q_0$, we put

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{A}(\to i) := \{\alpha \in Q_1 \mid e(\alpha) = i\} \\ &\mathcal{P}(\to i) := \{\ p \in \mathcal{P} \mid e(p) = i,\ l(p) \geq 1,\ p \notin I\} \\ &\mathcal{A}(j \to i) := \{\alpha \in Q_1 \mid s(\alpha) = j,\ e(\alpha) = i\}; \\ &\mathcal{P}(j \to i) := \{\ p \in \mathcal{P} \mid s(p) = j,\ e(p) = i,\ l(p) \geq 1,\ p \notin I\}.\end{aligned}$$

For a non-zero path p with $l(p) \geq 1$, we put

$$K_p := \{q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p)) \mid pq \in I\}. \tag{1.1}$$

1.4. *A representation X of Q over A* is a datum $(X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$, where each X_i is an A-module and each $X_\alpha : X_{s(\alpha)} \to X_{e(\alpha)}$ is an A-map. A morphism $f : X \to Y$ is a datum $(f_i,\ i \in Q_0)$, where $f_i : X_i \to Y_i$ is an A-map, such that for each arrow $\alpha : j \to i$ we have

$$Y_\alpha f_j = f_i X_\alpha. \tag{1.2}$$

We call X_i and f_i *the i-th branch* of X and *the i-th branch* of f, respectively. We also write X as $\begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_n \end{pmatrix}_{(X_\alpha,\ \alpha \in Q_1)}$, and a morphism as $\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_n \end{pmatrix}$. For path $p = \alpha_l \cdots \alpha_1$ with each $\alpha_i \in Q_1$, let X_p denote the A-map $X_{\alpha_l} \cdots X_{\alpha_1} : X_{s(\alpha_1)} \to X_{e(\alpha_l)}$.

A representation X of (Q, I) over A is a representation X of Q over A, such that $X_{\rho_i} = 0$ for each $\rho_i \in \rho$. Denote by $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ the category of finite-dimensional representations of (Q, I) over A. A

morphism f is a monomorphism (resp., an epimorphism, an isomorphism) if and only if each f_i is injective (resp., surjective, an isomorphism). A sequence $0 \to X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \to 0$ of morphisms in $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ is exact if and only if $0 \to X_i \xrightarrow{f_i} Y_i \xrightarrow{g_i} Z_i \to 0$ is exact in A-mod for each $i \in Q_0$.

Lemma 1.1. ([4, p.57], [28, p.44]) *We have an equivalence* Λ-mod $\cong \mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ *of categories.*

Throughout we will **identify a Λ-module with a representation of (Q, I) over A.**

As an object of $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, k)$ we have $P(v) = (e_i(kQ/I)e_v,\ P(v)_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$, where $P(v)_\alpha : e_{s(\alpha)}(kQ/I)e_v \to e_{e(\alpha)}(kQ/I)e_v$ is the k-map sending path w to αw. Consider functors $- \otimes P(v) : A\text{-mod} \to \mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$ and $-_v : \mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A) \to A\text{-mod}$ (by taking the i-th branch).

Lemma 1.2. (1) $(- \otimes P(v), -_v)$ *is an adjoint pair.*

(2) *The indecomposable projective Λ-modules are exactly $P \otimes P(v)$, where P are indecomposable projective A-modules. In particular, branches of projective Λ-modules are projective A-modules.*

Proof. Let $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1) \in \Lambda\text{-mod}$, $M \in A\text{-mod}$, and $f = (f_i,\ i \in Q_0) \in \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M \otimes P(v), X)$. Then $f_v \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, X_v)$. Since $M \otimes P(v) = (M \otimes e_i(kQ/I)e_v,\ \mathrm{id}_M \otimes P(v)_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$, it follows from (1.2) that for $i \neq v$ we have

$$f_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if there are no non-zero paths from } v \text{ to } i; \\ m \otimes p \mapsto X_p f_v(m), & \text{if there is a non-zero path } p \text{ from } v \text{ to } i. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

By (1.3) we see that $f \mapsto f_v$ gives an injective map $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M \otimes P(v), X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, X_v)$. It is also surjective, since for a given $f_v \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, X_v)$, $f = (f_i,\ i \in Q_0) : M \otimes P(v) \to X$ is indeed a morphism in $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$, where f_i is given by (1.3).

(2) is clear. ■

1.5. *A complete A-projective resolution* is an exact sequence of finitely generated projective A-modules $P^\bullet = \cdots \to P^{-1} \to P^0 \xrightarrow{d^0} P^1 \to \cdots$, such that $\mathrm{Hom}_A(P^\bullet, A)$ is also exact. An A-module M is *Gorenstein-projective*, if there is a complete A-projective resolution $P^\bullet$ such that $M \cong \mathrm{Ker}\, d^0$ ([13]). Let $\mathcal{P}(A)$ be the full subcategory of A-mod of projective modules, and $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ the full subcategory of A-mod consisting of Gorenstein-projective modules. Then $\mathcal{GP}(A) \subseteq {}^\perp A := \{X \in A\text{-mod} \mid \mathrm{Ext}^i_A(X, A) = 0,\ \forall\ i \geq 1\}$; and $\mathcal{GP}(A) = A$-mod if and only if A is self-injective. If $\mathrm{gl.dim} A < \infty$ then $\mathcal{GP}(A) = \mathcal{P}(A)$ (but the converse is *not* true); and if A is *a Gorenstein algebra* (i.e., $\mathrm{inj.dim}\ {}_AA < \infty$ and $\mathrm{inj.dim}\ A_A < \infty$) then $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is contravariantly finite in A-mod and $\mathcal{GP}(A) = {}^\perp A$ ([14, 11.5.4, 11.5.3]) (but the converse is *not* true). Note that $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is a resolving subcategory of A-mod, i.e., $\mathcal{GP}(A) \supseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$, $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is closed under extensions, the kernels of epimorphisms, and direct summands ([17]), and that $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is a Frobenius category with relative projective-injective objects being projective A-modules ([6]).

2. Monic monomial representations

Definition 2.1. *A representation $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$ of (Q, I) over A is a monic (monomial) representation, or a monic (monomial) Λ-module, provided that X satisfies the conditions*:

(m1) *For each $i \in Q_0$, the sum* $\sum\limits_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha$ *is a direct sum* $\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha$;

(m2) *For each $\alpha \in Q_1$, there holds* $\mathrm{Ker}\, X_\alpha = \sum\limits_{q \in K_\alpha} \mathrm{Im}\, X_q$, *where K_α is as in* (2.1).

Easy to see that (m1) and (m2) are independent. If $K_\alpha = \emptyset$, i.e., α is not the last arrow of all $\rho_i \in \rho$, then $\sum\limits_{q \in K_\alpha} \mathrm{Im}\, X_q$ is understood to be zero. We keep this convention throughout. In this case

(m2) says that X_α is injective (this is the case if $s(\alpha)$ is a source). In general, (m2) exactly says that $\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha} X_{s(q)} \xrightarrow{(X_q)_{q\in K_\alpha}} X_{s(\alpha)} \xrightarrow{X_\alpha} X_{e(\alpha)}$ is an exact sequence.

Denote by $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ the full subcategory of $\mathrm{rep}(Q,I,A)$ consisting of monic representations, which is called *the monomorphism category of* (Q,I) *over* A. Since $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ is closed under the direct summands, it is a Krull-Schmidt category ([28]).

Example 2.2. (1) *If* $I=0$, *then* (m1) *and* (m2) *exactly says that* $(X_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}: \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} X_{s(\alpha)} \to X_i$ *is injective for each* $i\in Q_0$ ([25]).

(2) *Indecomposable projective* kQ/I*-module* $P(v)=(e_i(kQ/I)e_v,\ P(v)_\alpha,\ i\in Q_0,\ \alpha\in Q_1)\in \mathrm{rep}(Q,I,k)$ *is monic for each* $v\in Q_0$, *and this gives all the indecomposable monic* kQ/I*-modules* (*see Corollary* 4.3).

(3) *Let* M *be an arbitrary* A*-module. Then* $M\otimes P(v)=(M\otimes e_i(kQ/I)e_v,\ \mathrm{Id}_M\otimes P(v)_\alpha,\ i\in Q_0,\ \alpha\in Q_1)$ *is a monic* Λ*-module for each* $v\in Q_0$. *Thus projective* Λ*-modules are monic* (*cf. Lemma* 1.2(2)). *So, monic* Λ*-modules are much more than projective* Λ*-modules, if* A *is not semisimple.*

(4) *Let* $A:=k[x]/\langle x^2\rangle$, *and* $\Lambda:=A\otimes kQ/I$ *with*

$$Q:=\quad 4\xrightarrow{\gamma} 3 \underset{\beta_2}{\overset{\beta_1}{\rightrightarrows}} 2\xrightarrow{\alpha} 1$$

and $I:=\langle\beta_1\gamma,\alpha\beta_2\gamma\rangle$. *Note that* A *has only two indecomposable modules* A *and* $k:=k\bar{x}$ (*up to ismomorphisms*), *with* $\mathrm{Hom}_A(A,k)=k\bar{x}$, $\mathrm{Hom}_A(k,A)=k\sigma$, $\mathrm{Hom}_A(A,A)=k\mathrm{Id}_A\oplus k\bar{x}$, *where* $0\to k\xrightarrow{\sigma}A\xrightarrow{\bar{x}}k\to 0$ *is the canonical exact sequence. Then*

$$X:=\quad k\xrightarrow{X_\gamma=\sigma} A \underset{X_{\beta_2}=\binom{\mathrm{Id}}{\bar{x}}}{\overset{X_{\beta_1}=\binom{0}{\bar{x}}}{\rightrightarrows}} A\oplus k\xrightarrow{X_\alpha=\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\bar{x}&0\\0&\mathrm{Id}\end{smallmatrix}\right)} k\oplus k$$

is a monic Λ*-module.*

The following result give properties of the structural A-maps of monic monomial representations.

Theorem 2.3. *Let* $X=(X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i\in Q_0,\ \alpha\in Q_1)$ *be a monic* Λ*-module, and* p *a non-zero path with* $l(p)\geq 1$. *Then*

(1) $\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p=\sum_{q\in K_p}\mathrm{Im}\, X_q$, *where* K_p *is as in* (1.1). *Thus, if* $s(p)$ *is a source then* X_p *is injective.*

(2) $\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p=(\bigoplus_{\beta\in B_1}\mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta)\oplus(\bigoplus_{\beta\in B_2}X_\beta(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta}))$, *where*

$$B_1:=\{\beta\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))\mid \beta=\mathrm{la}(q)\ \textit{for some}\ q\in\mathcal{P}(\to s(p)),\ p\beta\in I\},$$
$$B_2:=\{\beta\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))\mid \beta=\mathrm{la}(q)\ \textit{for some}\ q\in\mathcal{P}(\to s(p)),\ p\beta\notin I,\ pq\in I\}$$

(*If* $B_1=\emptyset=B_2$, *then it says that* X_p *is injective*).

(3) *Let* j *and* i *be distinct vertices of* Q. *Then* $\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}(j\to i)}\mathrm{Im}\, X_q=\bigoplus_{q\in\mathcal{P}(j\to i)}\mathrm{Im}\, X_q$.

Proof. (1) Use induction on the length $l(p)$. If $l(p)=1$, then the assertion is (m2). Suppose that $l(p)\geq 2$ with $p=p'\alpha$ and $\alpha\in Q_1$. Clearly $\sum_{q\in K_p}\mathrm{Im}\, X_q\subseteq\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p$. Let $x\in\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p$. Then $X_p(x)=X_{p'}X_\alpha(x)=0$, i.e., $X_\alpha(x)\in\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p'}$. Since $l(p')<l(p)$, by the induction $X_\alpha(x)\in\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p'}=\sum_{q\in K_{p'}}\mathrm{Im}\, X_q$. For each path

$q \in K_{p'} := \{q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p')) \mid p'q \in I\}$, we consider the last arrow β of q with $q = \beta q'$, where q' is a path, possibly of length 0. Graphically we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & s(\alpha) = s(p) & & \\ & & & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\ s(q') & \overset{q'}{\rightsquigarrow} & s(\beta) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & e(\alpha) = s(p') & \overset{p'}{\rightsquigarrow} & e(p). \end{array}$$

We divide all these paths q into two classes via $p'\beta \in I$, or $p'\beta \notin I$. Put

$$B_1 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p')) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q) \text{ for some } q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p')),\ p'\beta \in I\},$$
$$B_2 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p')) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q) \text{ for some } q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p')),\ p'\beta \notin I,\ p'q \in I\}.$$

Then $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$. For those paths $q = \beta q' \in K_{p'}$ such that $\beta \in B_1$ (this contains the case $l(q') = 0$), we use the inclusion $\operatorname{Im} X_q \subseteq \operatorname{Im} X_\beta$. Since for $\beta \in B_1$ we have $p'\beta \in I$, it follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{q \in K_{p'} \\ \mathrm{la}(q) \in B_1}} \operatorname{Im} X_q = \sum_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta \overset{(\mathrm{m1})}{=} \bigoplus_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta.$$

Then by (m1) we have

$$X_\alpha(x) \in \operatorname{Ker} X_{p'} = (\bigoplus_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta) \oplus (\bigoplus_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{q' \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(\beta)) \\ p'\beta q' \in I}} \operatorname{Im} X_{q'})). \qquad (*)$$

Since $p'\alpha = p \notin I$, we have $\alpha \notin B_1$. It follows from $(*)$ that either $X_\alpha(x) = 0$ (if $\alpha \notin B_2$), or (if $\alpha \in B_2$)

$$X_\alpha(x) \in X_\alpha(\sum_{\substack{q' \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha)) \\ p'\alpha q' \in I}} \operatorname{Im} X_{q'}).$$

In the both cases there are $x_{q'} \in X_{s(q')}$ such that

$$x - \sum_{\substack{q' \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha)) \\ pq' \in I}} X_{q'}(x_{q'}) \in \operatorname{Ker} X_\alpha.$$

Since $\operatorname{Ker} X_\alpha = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha)) \\ \alpha q \in I}} \operatorname{Im} X_q$ by (m2), it follows that $x \in \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p)) \\ pq \in I}} \operatorname{Im} X_q$, i.e., the assertion (1) holds.

(2) in fact has been proved above (see the equality in $(*)$).

(3) We first prove the following

Claim: If $\sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \\ pq \notin I}} X_q(x_q) \in \operatorname{Ker} X_p$ with each $x_q \in X_{s(q)}$, then $X_p X_q(x_q) = 0$ for each q.

Set $l_p := 0$ if $s(p)$ is a source; otherwise l_p is defined to be the maximal length of all the paths q of length ≥ 1 to $s(p)$. We stress that $l_p \neq \max\{l(q) \mid q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p))\}$ in general, since $q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p))$ means that q is a non-zero path (considering all the paths rather than only non-zero paths here will make the argument below easier). Use induction on l_p. If $l_p = 0$ then the assertion trivially holds.

Suppose that $l_p \geq 1$. Put $x := \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \\ pq \notin I}} X_q(x_q)$. Note that the index set $\{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \mid pq \notin I\}$ is a disjoint union of

$$C_1 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(j \to s(p)) \mid p\beta \notin I\}$$

and

$$\{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \mid pq \notin I,\ l(q) \geq 2\}.$$

Denote by C_2 the set of the last arrows of $q \in \{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \mid pq \notin I,\ l(q) \geq 2\}$. Since any arrow β in C_2 does not starts from j, it follows that $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$. Thus $x = x_1 + x_2$ with

$$x_1 := \sum_{\beta \in C_1} X_\beta(x_\beta), \quad x_2 = \sum_{\beta \in C_2} X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta q \notin I}} X_q(x_q)).$$

On the other hand, by (2) we have $\operatorname{Ker} X_p = (\bigoplus_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta) \oplus (\bigoplus_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta(\operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}))$, where

$$B_1 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p)) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q) \text{ for some } q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p)),\ p\beta \in I\},$$
$$B_2 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p)) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q) \text{ for some } q \in \mathcal{P}(\to s(p)),\ p\beta \notin I,\ pq \in I\}$$

Thus $x = y_1 + y_2$ with $y_1 \in \sum_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta$ and $y_2 \in \sum_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta(\operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta})$. Note that

$$C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset, \quad B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset, \quad B_1 \cap C_1 = \emptyset, \quad B_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset.$$

By $x_1 + x_2 = y_1 + y_2$ and (m1) we see that $y_1 = 0$. So $x = x_1 + x_2 \in \sum_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta(\operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta})$. We discuss each summand $X_q(x_q)$ of

$$x = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(p)) \\ pq \notin I}} X_q(x_q) = \sum_{\beta \in C_1} X_\beta(x_\beta) + \sum_{\beta \in C_2} X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w))$$

in several cases. Our aim is to prove that $X_p X_q(x_q) = 0$ for each summand $X_q(x_q)$ of x.

Case 1. If $\beta \in C_1 \setminus B_2$, then by (m1) we see that the summand $X_\beta(x_\beta)$ of x is 0, and hence $X_p X_\beta(x_\beta) = 0$.

Case 2. If $\beta \in C_1 \cap B_2$, then by (m1) we see that $X_\beta(x_\beta) = X_\beta(x'_\beta)$ with $x'_\beta \in \operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}$, it follows that

$$X_p X_\beta(x_\beta) = X_p X_\beta(x'_\beta) = X_{p\beta}(x'_\beta) = 0.$$

Case 3. If $\beta \in C_2 \setminus B_2$, then by (m1) we see that the summand $X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w))$ of x is 0, and hence

$$\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w) \in \operatorname{Ker} X_\beta \subseteq \operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}.$$

Since $l_{p\beta} < l_p$, by induction $X_{p\beta} X_w(x_w) = 0$, i.e., $X_p X_\beta X_w(x_w) = 0$.

Case 4. If $\beta \in C_2 \cap B_2$, then by (m1) we see that $X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w)) = X_\beta(x'_\beta)$ with $x'_\beta \in \operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}$. It follows that

$$X_p X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w)) = X_p X_\beta(x'_\beta) = X_{p\beta}(x'_\beta) = 0,$$

i.e., $\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{P}(j \to s(\beta)) \\ p\beta w \notin I}} X_w(x_w) \in \operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}$. Since $l_{p\beta} < l_p$, by induction $X_{p\beta} X_w(x_w) = 0$, i.e., $X_p X_\beta X_w(x_w) = 0$.

All together **Claim** is proved.

Now, let $\sum\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(j\to i)} X_p(x_p)=0$ with each $x_p\in X_j$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(j\to i)} X_p(x_p)=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(j\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha)+\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(j\to i)\setminus\mathcal{A}(j\to i)} X_p(x_p)\\&=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(j\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha)+\sum_{\beta\in\mathcal{A}(s(\beta)\to i)} X_\beta(\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(j\to s(\beta))\\ \beta q\notin I}} X_q(x_{\beta q})).\end{aligned}$$

Since all those arrows β do not start from j, by (m1) we have $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(j\to i)$ and $X_\beta(\sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(j\to s(\beta))\\ \beta q\notin I}} X_q(x_{\beta q}))=0$ for all the β's above. Thus $\sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(j\to s(\beta))\\ \beta q\notin I}} X_q(x_{\beta q})\in \mathrm{Ker}X_\beta$. It follows from **Claim** that each $X_\beta X_q(x_{\beta q})=0$. This proves (3). ■

3. **Resolvability**

A full subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of Λ-mod is *resolving* if $\mathcal{X}$ contains all the projective Λ-modules, $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, the kernels of epimorphisms, and direct summands ([2]).

Theorem 3.1. *The monomorphism category* $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ *is a resolving subcategory of* Λ*-mod.*

Thus, $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ *has enough projective objects, which are exactly projective* Λ*-modules. In particular, each branch of projective objects of* $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ *is a projective* A*-module.*

Proof. By Example 2.2(3) $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ contains $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$. Clearly $\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$ is closed under direct summands. Let $0\to X\xrightarrow{f}Y\xrightarrow{g}Z\to 0$ be an exact sequence in $\mathrm{rep}(Q,I,A)$ with $X,Z\in\mathrm{mon}(Q,I,A)$.

Claim 1: Y satisfies (m1), i.e., $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\mathrm{Im}\,Y_\alpha=\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\mathrm{Im}\,Y_\alpha$ for each $i\in Q_0$.

The argument is a diagram chasing. By (1.2) we have a commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}0&\longrightarrow&\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}X_{s(\alpha)}&\xrightarrow{\oplus f_{s(\alpha)}}&\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}Y_{s(\alpha)}&\xrightarrow{\oplus g_{s(\alpha)}}&\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}Z_{s(\alpha)}&\longrightarrow&0\\ &&\downarrow{\scriptstyle (X_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}}&&\downarrow{\scriptstyle (Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}}&&\downarrow{\scriptstyle (Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}}&&\\ 0&\longrightarrow&X_i&\xrightarrow{f_i}&Y_i&\xrightarrow{g_i}&Z_i&\longrightarrow&0.\end{array}\tag{3.1}$$

Note that $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\mathrm{Im}\,Y_\alpha=\mathrm{Im}(Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}$. Let $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}Y_\alpha(y_\alpha)=0$ for some $y_\alpha\in Y_{s(\alpha)}$. By the right square above we have

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} g_iY_\alpha(y_\alpha)=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} Z_\alpha g_{s(\alpha)}(y_\alpha)=0.$$

Since Z satisfies (m1), we have $Z_\alpha g_{s(\alpha)}(y_\alpha)=0$ for each α. By (m2) on Z we get $g_{s(\alpha)}(y_\alpha)=\sum\limits_{q\in K_\alpha}Z_q(z_q)$ for some $z_q\in Z_{s(q)}$. Since $g_{s(q)}:Y_{s(q)}\to Z_{s(q)}$ is surjective, there exists $y_q\in Y_{s(q)}$ such that $z_q=g_{s(q)}(y_q)$. So by (1.2) we have (note that $e(q)=s(\alpha)$)

$$g_{s(\alpha)}(y_\alpha)=\sum_{q\in K_\alpha}Z_q(g_{s(q)}(y_q))=\sum_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(\alpha)}(Y_q(y_q))$$

for each $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)$, i.e., $y_\alpha-\sum\limits_{q\in K_\alpha}Y_q(y_q)\in\mathrm{Ker}\,g_{s(\alpha)}=\mathrm{Im}\,f_{s(\alpha)}$. Hence

$$y_\alpha-\sum_{q\in K_\alpha}Y_q(y_q)=f_{s(\alpha)}(x_\alpha)$$

for some $x_\alpha\in X_{s(\alpha)}$. Applying Y_α and by $Y_\alpha Y_q=0$ for each $q\in K_\alpha$, we have

$$Y_\alpha(y_\alpha)=Y_\alpha(f_{s(\alpha)}(x_\alpha))=f_i(X_\alpha(x_\alpha)).$$

By $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} Y_\alpha(y_\alpha)=0$ we have $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} f_i(X_\alpha(x_\alpha))=0$, and hence $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ since f_i is injective. Since X satisfies (m1), we have $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for each $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)$, and hence $Y_\alpha(y_\alpha)=f_i(X_\alpha(x_\alpha))=0$. This proves **Claim 1**.

Claim 2: Y satisfies (m2), i.e., $\operatorname{Ker} Y_\alpha=\sum_{q\in K_\alpha}\operatorname{Im} Y_q$ for each $\alpha\in Q_1$.

In fact, by (1.2) we have a commutative diagram with exact rows



Viewing columns as complexes such that $X_{s(\alpha)}$ is at position zero, the diagram above gives a short exact sequence of complexes, and hence it induces a long exact sequence of cohomologies. The assumption that X and Z satisfy (m2) means that the 0-th cohomologies of the complexes on the left and on the right are zero. It follows that the 0-th cohomologies of the complex at the middle is also zero, i.e., Y satisfies (m2). This proves **Claim 2**, and hence that $\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$ is closed under extensions.

Now we prove that $\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$ is closed under the kernels of epimorphisms. Let $0\to X\xrightarrow{f} Y\xrightarrow{g} Z\to 0$ be an exact sequence in $\operatorname{rep}(Q,I,A)$ with $Y,Z\in\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$. We need to prove that X satisfies (m1) and (m2). Let $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for some $x_\alpha\in X_{s(\alpha)}$. By the left square in (3.1) we have $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} Y_\alpha f_{s(\alpha)}(x_\alpha)=0$. Since Y satisfies (m1), we have $Y_\alpha f_{s(\alpha)}(x_\alpha)=0$ for each α. By (1.2) this is exactly $f_iX_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$. Since f_i is injective, we have $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for each $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)$. This proves that X satisfies (m1). It remains to prove that X satisfies (m2), i.e., $\operatorname{Ker} X_\alpha=\sum_{q\in K_\alpha}\operatorname{Im} X_q$ for each $\alpha\in E$. This follows from the following sub-lemma.

Finally, by Example 2.2(3) projective Λ-modules are monic. From this and the fact that $\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$ is closed under the kernels of epimorphisms we see that $\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$ has enough projective objects, which are exactly projective Λ-modules. ■

Sub-Lemma 3.2. *Let $0\to X\xrightarrow{f} Y\xrightarrow{g} Z\to 0$ be an exact sequence in $\operatorname{rep}(Q,I,A)$ with Y and Z in $\operatorname{mon}(Q,I,A)$. Then $\operatorname{Ker} X_p=\sum_{q\in K_p}\operatorname{Im} X_q$ for each non-zero path p, where K_p is as in (1.1).*

Proof. Define l_p as in the proof of Theorem 2.3(3). Use induction on l_p. If $l_p:=0$, then $s(p)$ is a source and hence $\operatorname{Ker} Y_p=0$ by Theorem 2.3(1). So $\operatorname{Ker} X_p=0$, i.e., the assertion holds.

Suppose that the assertion holds for all the non-zero paths with $l_p < m$ ($m \geq 1$). We prove the assertion for non-zero path p with $l_p = m$. Let $x \in \operatorname{Ker} X_p$. By the commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{s(p)} & \xrightarrow{f_{s(p)}} & Y_{s(p)} & \xrightarrow{g_{s(p)}} & Z_{s(p)} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle X_p} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Y_p} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Z_p} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{e(p)} & \xrightarrow{f_{e(p)}} & Y_{e(p)} & \xrightarrow{g_{e(p)}} & Z_{e(p)} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

we have $f_{s(p)}(x) \in \operatorname{Ker} Y_p$. By Theorem 2.3(2) we know that $f_{s(p)}(x)$ is of the form

$$f_{s(p)}(x) = \sum_{\beta \in B_1} Y_\beta(y_\beta) + \sum_{\beta \in B_2} Y_\beta(y_\beta)$$

where $y_\beta \in Y_{s(\beta)}$ for each $\beta \in B_1 \dot\cup B_2$, moreover $y_\beta \in \operatorname{Ker} Y_{p\beta}$ for each $\beta \in B_2$. By (1.2) we have

$$\sum_{\beta \in B_1 \dot\cup B_2} Z_\beta g_{s(\beta)}(y_\beta) = \sum_{\beta \in B_1 \dot\cup B_2} g_{s(p)} Y_\beta(y_\beta) = g_{s(p)} f_{s(p)}(x) = 0.$$

Since $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ and Z satisfies $(m1)$, we have $Z_\beta g_{s(\beta)}(y_\beta) = 0$ for each $\beta \in B_1 \dot\cup B_2$. Then by (m2) on Z we have $g_{s(\beta)}(y_\beta) \in \operatorname{Ker} Z_\beta = \sum\limits_{q \in K_\beta} \operatorname{Im} Z_q$, so there are some $z_q \in Z_{s(q)}$ such that $g_{s(\beta)}(y_\beta) = \sum\limits_{q \in K_\beta} Z_q(z_q)$. Since $g_{s(q)}$ is surjective, there are $y_q \in Y_{s(q)}$ such that $z_q = g_{s(q)}(y_q)$. Thus

$$g_{s(\beta)}(y_\beta) = \sum_{q \in K_\beta} Z_q(g_{s(q)}(y_q)) = \sum_{q \in K_\beta} g_{s(\beta)}(Y_q(y_q)),$$

and hence $y_\beta - \sum\limits_{q \in K_\beta} Y_q(y_q) \in \operatorname{Ker} g_{s(\beta)} = \operatorname{Im} f_{s(\beta)}$, i.e., $y_\beta - \sum\limits_{q \in K_\beta} Y_q(y_q) = f_{s(\beta)}(x_\beta)$ for some $x_\beta \in X_{s(\beta)}$. Thus for each $\beta \in B_1 \dot\cup B_2$ we have $Y_\beta(y_\beta) = Y_\beta f_{s(\beta)}(x_\beta)$.

Now for each $\beta \in B_2$, since $y_\beta \in \operatorname{Ker} Y_{p\beta}$, we have

$$f_{e(p)} X_p X_\beta(x_\beta) = Y_p f_{s(p)} X_\beta(x_\beta) = Y_p Y_\beta f_{s(\beta)}(x_\beta) = Y_p Y_\beta(y_\beta) = 0,$$

and hence $x_\beta \in \operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta}$ for each $\beta \in B_2$. Since $l_{p\beta} < l_p$, by induction $\operatorname{Ker} X_{p\beta} = \sum\limits_{q \in K_{p\beta}} \operatorname{Im} X_q$. So

$$\begin{aligned} f_{s(p)}(x) &= \sum_{\beta \in B_1} Y_\beta f_{s(\beta)}(x_\beta) + \sum_{\beta \in B_2} Y_\beta f_{s(\beta)}(x_\beta) \\ &= \sum_{\beta \in B_1} f_{s(p)} X_\beta(x_\beta) + \sum_{\beta \in B_2} f_{s(p)} X_\beta(x_\beta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_{s(p)}$ is injective, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \sum_{\beta \in B_1} X_\beta(x_\beta) + \sum_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta(x_\beta) \in \sum_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta + \sum_{\beta \in B_2} X_\beta\Big(\sum_{q \in K_{p\beta}} \operatorname{Im} X_q\Big) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{\beta \in B_1} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta + \sum_{q \in K_p} \operatorname{Im} X_q \subseteq \sum_{q \in K_p} \operatorname{Im} X_q. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

It seems to be more difficult to get all the injective objects of $\operatorname{mon}(Q, I, A)$. We can only give some indecomposable injective objects of $\operatorname{mon}(Q, I, A)$. This is needed in the next section.

Proposition 3.3. *Let N be an indecomposable injective A-module and $P(v)$ the indecomposable projective kQ/I-module at $v \in Q_0$. Then $N \otimes P(v)$ is an indecomposable injective object of* $\operatorname{mon}(Q, I, A)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1.2 $N \otimes P(v)$ is an indecomposable object of $\operatorname{mon}(Q, I, A)$. Put $L := D(A_A) \otimes kQ/I$, where $D := \operatorname{Hom}_k(-, k)$. It suffices to prove that L is an injective object of $\operatorname{mon}(Q, I, A)$. Use induction on $|Q_0|$. Write L as $L = (L_i,\ L_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$. Let Q'' be the quiver by deleting sink vertex 1 from

Q, and $I'' := \langle \rho_i \mid e(\rho_i) \neq 1\rangle$. For a Λ-module X, let X'' be the $(A \otimes kQ''/I'')$-module by deleting the first branch X_1 from X. For a Λ-map f, we similarly define f''.

Let $0 \to X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \to 0$ be an exact sequence and $h : X \to L$ a morphism, both in $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$. Then $0 \to X'' \xrightarrow{f''} Y'' \xrightarrow{g''} Z'' \to 0$ is an exact sequence in $\mathrm{mon}(Q'', I'', A)$. By induction $L'' := D(A_A) \otimes kQ/I''$ is an injective object of $\mathrm{mon}(Q'', I'', A)$. So there is a morphism $u'' = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 \\ \vdots \\ u_n \end{pmatrix} : Y'' \to L''$ in $\mathrm{rep}(Q'', I'', A)$ such that $h'' = u''f''$. Thus, it suffices to prove the following

Claim: there is an A-map $u_1 : Y_1 \to L_1$ such that $u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ \vdots \\ u_n \end{pmatrix} : Y \to L$ is a morphism in $\mathrm{rep}(Q, I, A)$, and that $h_1 = u_1 f_1$.

Since L_1 is a direct of copies of $D(A_A)$, it is an injective A-module. So there is an A-map $u_1' : Y_1 \to L_1$ such that $h_1 = u_1' f_1$. Consider the A-map $(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} : \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} Y_{s(\alpha)} \to L_1$ and the exact sequence of A-modules

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} X_{s(\alpha)} \xrightarrow{\oplus f_{s(\alpha)}} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} Y_{s(\alpha)} \xrightarrow{\oplus g_{s(\alpha)}} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} Z_{s(\alpha)} \to 0.$$

Since f and h are morphisms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} \circ \oplus f_{s(\alpha)} = (L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} f_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha f_{s(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} \\ &= (L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} f_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' f_1 X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} = (L_\alpha h_{s(\alpha)} - h_1 X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)}$ factors through $\oplus g_{s(\alpha)}$, i.e., there is an A-map $v : \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} Z_{s(\alpha)} \to L_1$ such that

$$(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} = v \circ \oplus g_{s(\alpha)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Put E to be the set of the last arrows of $\rho_i \in \rho$. Write $\mathcal{A}(\to 1)$ as a disjoint union $\mathcal{A}(\to 1) = A_1 \dot\cup A_2$, where $A_1 := \mathcal{A}(\to 1) \setminus E$ and $A_2 := \mathcal{A}(\to 1) \cap E$. For each $\alpha \in A_2$, put $Z^\alpha := (Z_q)_{q \in K_\alpha} : \bigoplus\limits_{q \in K_\alpha} Z_{s(q)} \to Z_{s(\alpha)}$. Similarly we have Y^α and L^α. Clearly we have

$$Z_\alpha Z^\alpha = 0, \quad Y_\alpha Y^\alpha = 0, \quad L_\alpha L^\alpha = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

By (m2) we have $\mathrm{Im}\, Z^\alpha = \mathrm{Ker}\, Z_\alpha, \quad \mathrm{Im}\, Y^\alpha = \mathrm{Ker}\, Y_\alpha$.

Consider the A-map $\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Z^\alpha : \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} (\bigoplus\limits_{q \in K_\alpha} Z_{s(q)}) \to \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Z_{s(\alpha)}$, also the A-map

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Z^\alpha \end{pmatrix} : \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_2} (\bigoplus_{q \in K_\alpha} Z_{s(q)}) \to (\bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_1} Z_{s(\alpha)}) \oplus (\bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_2} Z_{s(\alpha)}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to 1)} Z_{s(\alpha)}.$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{Im}(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Z^\alpha \end{pmatrix}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_2} \mathrm{Ker}\, Z_\alpha, \qquad \mathrm{Im}(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Y^\alpha \end{pmatrix}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_2} \mathrm{Ker}\, Y_\alpha.$$

Thus

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha \in A_2} Z^\alpha \end{pmatrix} = \sigma_2 \circ \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_2} \widetilde{Z^\alpha}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z^\alpha}:\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}(\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}Z_{s(q)})\twoheadrightarrow\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Ker}Z_\alpha$, and $\sigma_2:\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Ker}Z_\alpha\hookrightarrow\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}Z_{s(\alpha)}$ is the embedding. By (1.2) we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}(\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}Y_{s(q)}) & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Y^\alpha\end{pmatrix}} & \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}Y_{s(\alpha)}\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(q)}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}g_{s(\alpha)}}\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}(\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}Z_{s(q)}) & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Z^\alpha\end{pmatrix}} & \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}Z_{s(\alpha)}\end{array}\tag{3.5}$$

where the vertical maps are surjective. For each $\alpha\in A_2$ we have the exact sequence

$$0\longrightarrow\operatorname{Ker}Z_\alpha\hookrightarrow Z_{s(\alpha)}\xrightarrow{\widetilde{Z_\alpha}}\operatorname{Im}Z_\alpha\longrightarrow 0$$

induced by $Z_\alpha:Z_{s(\alpha)}\to Z_1$, and hence we have exact sequence

$$0\longrightarrow\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Ker}Z_\alpha\longrightarrow\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Z_{s(\alpha)}\xrightarrow{\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z_\alpha}}\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Im}Z_\alpha\longrightarrow 0.$$

Thus we have exact sequence

$$0\longrightarrow\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Ker}Z_\alpha\xrightarrow{\sigma_2}\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}Z_{s(\alpha)}\xrightarrow{\pi}(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_1}Z_{s(\alpha)})\oplus(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Im}Z_\alpha)\longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\pi:=\begin{pmatrix}\mathrm{id}_{\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_1}Z_{s(\alpha)}} & 0\\ 0 & \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z_\alpha}\end{pmatrix}$. Composing $v:\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}Z_{s(\alpha)}\longrightarrow L_1$ on the right with $\sigma_2\circ\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z^\alpha}\circ(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(q)})$, by (3.4), (3.5), (3.2) and (3.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}v\circ\sigma_2\circ\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z^\alpha}\circ(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(q)}) &= v\circ\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Z^\alpha\end{pmatrix}\circ(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(q)})\\ &= v\circ(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}g_{s(\alpha)})\circ\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Y^\alpha\end{pmatrix}=(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)}-u_1'Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}\circ\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Y^\alpha\end{pmatrix}\\ &=(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)}-u_1'Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_2}\circ\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}Y^\alpha=(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)}Y^\alpha-u_1'Y_\alpha Y^\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_2}\\ &=(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)}Y^\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_2}=(L_\alpha L^\alpha\circ\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}u_{s(q)})_{\alpha\in A_2}=0,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}Y_{s(q)} & \xrightarrow{Y^\alpha} & Y_{s(\alpha)}\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}u_{s(q)}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u_{s(\alpha)}}\\ \bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}L_{s(q)} & \xrightarrow{L^\alpha} & L_{s(\alpha)}.\end{array}$$

Since $\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\widetilde{Z^\alpha}\circ\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\bigoplus_{q\in K_\alpha}g_{s(q)}$ is surjective, we get $v\circ\sigma_2=0$, thus v factors through π. Hence there is an A-map

$$t:(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_1}Z_{s(\alpha)})\oplus(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2}\operatorname{Im}Z_\alpha)\longrightarrow L_1$$

such that $v = t\pi$. Since L_1 is an injective A-module, there is an A-map $w : Z_1 \longrightarrow L_1$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_1} Z_{s(\alpha)}) \oplus (\bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2} \operatorname{Im} Z_\alpha) & \xrightarrow{((Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1},\sigma)} & Z_1 \\ {\scriptstyle t}\downarrow & \swarrow_{w} & \\ L_1 & & \end{array}$$

commutes, where σ is the embedding (note that $(Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1}$ is injective by (m2), and hence $((Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1},\sigma)$ injective by (m1)). All together we have

$$\begin{aligned} v = t\pi &= w((Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1},\sigma)\pi = w((Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1},\sigma)\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{id} & 0 \\ 0 & \bigoplus_{\alpha\in A_2} \widetilde{Z_\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= w((Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_1},(Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A_2}) = w(Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Now put $u_1 := u_1' + wg_1 : Y_1 \to L_1$, where $g_1 : Y_1 \to Z_1$ is the 1-st branch of $g : Y \to Z$. Then $u_1 f_1 = u_1' f_1 + wg_1 f_1 = u_1' f_1 = h_1$. It remains to prove that $u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ \vdots \\ u_n \end{pmatrix} : Y \to L$ is a Λ-map, i.e., for each arrow $\alpha : s(\alpha) \to 1$ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_{s(\alpha)} & \xrightarrow{u_{s(\alpha)}} & L_{s(\alpha)} \\ {\scriptstyle Y_\alpha}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle L_\alpha} \\ L_1 & \xrightarrow{u_1} & L_1 \end{array}$$

commutes. In fact by (3.2) and (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)} = v \circ \oplus g_{s(\alpha)} \\ &= w \circ (Z_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)} \circ \oplus g_{s(\alpha)} = w \circ (Z_\alpha g_{s(\alpha)})_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)} \\ &= w \circ (g_1 Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)} = (wg_1 Y_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} - u_1' Y_\alpha = wg_1 Y_\alpha$, i.e., $L_\alpha u_{s(\alpha)} = u_1 Y_\alpha$.

This proves **Claim**, and hence completes the proof. ■

4. **Main result**

Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra over field k, Q a finite acyclic quiver, I an ideal of kQ generated by monomial relations, and $\Lambda := A \otimes kQ/I$. Note that Λ is not necessarily a Gorenstein algebra. Our aim is to characterize the Gorenstein-projective Λ-modules.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$ be an arbitrary Λ-module. Then X is Gorenstein-projective if and only if X is a monic Λ-module satisfying condition* (G)*, where*

(G) *For each $i \in Q_0$, X_i and $X_i/(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_\alpha)$ are Gorenstein-projective A-modules.*

Note that for a monic Λ-module X, by (m1) we have $X_i/(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_\alpha) = X_i/(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_\alpha)$.

4.1. Before a proof we give some applications. If G is an indecomposable Gorenstein-projective A-module, then $G \otimes P(v)$ is an indecomposable monic Λ-module for each $v \in Q_0$ (cf. Lemma 1.2 and Example 2.2(3)). It is easy to see that $G \otimes P(v)$ satisfies condition (G). Thus by Theorem 4.1 we have

Corollary 4.2. *Let G be an indecomposable Gorenstein-projective A-module. Then $G \otimes P(v)$ is an indecomposable Gorenstein-projective Λ-module for each $v \in Q_0$.*

In Example 2.2(3) we have known that projective Λ-modules are monic.

Corollary 4.3. *Monic Λ-modules are exactly projective Λ-modules if and only if A is a semisimple algebra.*

In particular, monic kQ/I-modules are exactly projective kQ/I-modules.

Proof. It suffices to prove that A is semisimple if and only if any monic Λ-module is projective. Without loss of generality we may assume that A is *connected* (i.e., A can not be a product of two non-zero algebras).

Suppose that A is semisimple. By Wedderburn Theorem $A \cong M_n(R)$, the matrix algebra over a division k-algebra R, hence $A \otimes\ kQ/I \cong M_n(R \otimes\ kQ/I)$. Since $M_n(R \otimes\ kQ/I)$ is Morita equivalent to $R \otimes\ kQ/I \cong RQ/I$, and gl.dim.$RQ/I < \infty$ (as in the case of $R = k$), we have gl.dim.$(A \otimes\ kQ/I) < \infty$. Now let M be a monic Λ-module. Then by Theorem 4.1 M is a Gorenstein-projective Λ-module (since in this case any A-module is projective, and hence condition (G) holds automatically). While by [14, 10.2.3] Gorenstein-projective modules over an algebra of finite global dimension must be projective, it follows that M is a projective Λ-module.

Conversely, assume that any monic Λ-module is projective. Let M be an arbitrary A-module. Consider Λ-module $X = M \otimes P(1)$, where $P(1)$ is the simple projective kQ/I-module at sink vertex 1. Then X is a monic Λ-module, and hence a projective Λ-module by assumption. Thus 1-st branch M of X is a projective A-module (cf. Lemma 1.2(2)). This proves that A is semisimple. ■

For a Frobenius category we refer to [27] and [21, Appendix A].

Corollary 4.4. *The following are equivalent*:

(i) *A is a self-injective algebra*;

(ii) $\mathcal{GP}(A \otimes kQ/I) = \mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$;

(iii) $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ *is a* Frobenius *category.*

Proof. (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii): If A is self-injective, then every A-module is Gorenstein-projective, and hence (ii) follows from Theorem 4.1. The implication (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii) is well-known.

(iii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i): Taking sink vertex 1 of Q, by Proposition 3.3 $D(A_A) \otimes P(1)$ is an injective object of $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$, where $D := \mathrm{Hom}_k(-, k)$, hence by assumption it is a projective object of $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$. While each branch of a projective object of $\mathrm{mon}(Q, I, A)$ is a projective A-module (cf. Theorem 3.1), it follows that the 1-st branch $D(A_A)$ of $D(A_A) \otimes P(1)$ is a projective A-module, i.e., A is self-injective. ■

Let $D^b(\Lambda)$ be the bounded derived category of Λ, and $K^b(\mathcal{P}(\Lambda))$ the bounded homotopy category of $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$. By definition the singularity category $D^b_{sg}(\Lambda)$ of Λ is the Verdier quotient $D^b(\Lambda)/K^b(\mathcal{P}(\Lambda))$. If Λ is Gorenstein, then there is a triangle-equivalence $D^b_{sg}(\Lambda) \cong \underline{\mathcal{GP}(\Lambda)}$ ([8, 4.4.1]; [16, 4.6]). Note that if A is Gorenstein, then $\Lambda = A \otimes_k\ kQ/I$ is also Gorenstein. By Corollary 4.4 we have

Corollary 4.5. *Let A be a self-injective algebra, Q, I and $\Lambda = A \otimes\ kQ/I$ as usual. Then there is a triangle-equivalence $D^b_{sg}(\Lambda) \cong \underline{\mathrm{Mon}(Q, I, A)}$.*

4.2. For proving Theorem 4.1 we first show that the condition (G) can be simplified.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$ be a monic Λ-module such that $X_i/(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}(\to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha)$ is Gorenstein-projective for each $i \in Q_0$. Then*

(1) *For each non-zero path p,* $\mathrm{Im}X_p$ *is Gorenstein-projective.*

(2) *X satisfies condition* (G).

Proof. (1) Note that $\mathrm{Im}X_p \cong X_{s(p)}/\mathrm{Ker}X_p$. Use induction on $l_p := \max\{l(q) \mid q \in \mathcal{P},\ e(q) = s(p)\}$. If $l_p = 0$, then $s(p)$ is a source and X_p is injective, and hence $\mathrm{Im}X_p \cong X_{s(p)}$; while in this case $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha = 0$ and hence by the assumption $X_{s(p)}$ is Gorenstein-projective.

Suppose $l_p \geq 1$. Since $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is closed under extensions, by the assumption and the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \frac{\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Im}X_p \longrightarrow \frac{X_{s(p)}}{\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha} \longrightarrow 0$$

it suffices to prove that the left hand side term is Gorenstein-projective.

By Theorem 2.3(2) $\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p = (\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_1} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta) \oplus (\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_2} X_\beta(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta}))$, where $B_1 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p)) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q)$ for some $q \in K_p,\ p\beta \in I\}$ and $B_2 := \{\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\to s(p)) \mid \beta = \mathrm{la}(q)$ for some $q \in K_p,\ p\beta \notin I\}$. Put $\Omega := \mathcal{A}(\to s(p)) \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$. Then $\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha = (\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\Omega} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha) \oplus (\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_1\cup B_2} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta)$ and $\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p \subseteq \bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_1\cup B_2} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to s(p))} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p} &= (\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Omega} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha) \oplus \frac{\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_1\cup B_2} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_p} = (\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Omega} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha) \oplus \frac{\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_2} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta}{\bigoplus\limits_{\beta\in B_2} X_\beta(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta})} \\ &\cong (\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Omega} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha) \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta\in B_2} \frac{\mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta}{X_\beta(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta})}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha \in \Omega$ then $l_\alpha < l_p$, and hence by induction $\mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha$ is Gorenstein-projective. If $\beta \in B_2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{Im}\, X_\beta}{X_\beta(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta})} &\cong \frac{X_{s(\beta)}/\mathrm{Ker}\, X_\beta}{(\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta} + \mathrm{Ker}\, X_\beta)/\mathrm{Ker}\, X_\beta} \\ &\cong \frac{X_{s(\beta)}}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta} + \mathrm{Ker}\, X_\beta} \\ &= \frac{X_{s(\beta)}}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta}} = \frac{X_{s(p\beta)}}{\mathrm{Ker}\, X_{p\beta}} \\ &\cong \mathrm{Im}X_{p\beta},\end{aligned}$$

and hence it is Gorenstein-projective by induction (since $l_{p\beta} < l_p$). This proves (1).

(2) We need to show that each X_i Gorenstein-projective. This follows from the exact sequence $0 \to \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha \to X_i \to X_i/(\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_\alpha) \to 0$, the assumption and (1), again using the fact that $\mathcal{GP}(A)$ is closed under extensions. ∎

4.3. Let A and B be rings, M an A-B-bimodule, and $T := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & M \\ 0 & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ the triangular matrix ring. We assume that T is an Artin algebra ([4], p.72), and consider finitely generated T-modules. Recall that a T-module can be identified with a triple $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} X \\ Y \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi$, where $X \in A$-mod, $Y \in B$-mod, and $\phi : M \otimes_B Y \to X$ is an A-map. A Λ-map $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} X \\ Y \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi \to \left(\begin{smallmatrix} X' \\ Y' \end{smallmatrix}\right)_{\phi'}$ can be identified with a pair $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} f \\ g \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(X, X')$, $g \in \mathrm{Hom}_B(Y, Y')$, such that $f\phi = \phi'(\mathrm{id} \otimes g)$. The following description of $\mathcal{GP}(T)$ is a special case of [49, Thm. 1.4].

Lemma 4.7. *Let M be an A-B-bimodule with* $\mathrm{proj.dim}_A M < \infty$ *and* $\mathrm{proj.dim} M_B < \infty$, *and $T := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & M \\ 0 & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} X \\ Y \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi \in \mathcal{GP}(T)$ if and only if $\phi : M \otimes_B Y \to X$ is an injective A-map,* $\mathrm{Coker}\, \phi \in \mathcal{GP}(A)$, *and $Y \in \mathcal{GP}(B)$.*

In order to apply Lemma 4.7 we put

$$\rho' := \{\rho_i \in \rho \mid s(\rho_i) \neq n\}; \qquad I' := \langle \rho_i \mid \rho_i \in \rho' \rangle;$$
$$Q' := \text{the quiver obtained from } Q \text{ by deleting vertex } n;$$
$$P(n) := \text{the indecomposable projective } kQ/I\text{-module at } n;$$
$$\Lambda' := A \otimes kQ'/I'; \qquad M := A \otimes \mathrm{rad}P(n).$$

Then M is a Λ'-A-bimodule. The point is that $\Lambda = A \otimes kQ/I$ is of the form $\Lambda = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \Lambda' & M \\ 0 & A \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Since $\mathrm{gl.dim}.kQ'/I' < \infty$, we have $\mathrm{proj.dim}_{kQ'/I'}\mathrm{rad}P(n) < \infty$, and hence $\mathrm{proj.dim}_{\Lambda'}M < \infty$. Clearly, as a right A-module M is projective. For applying Lemma 4.7, we write a Λ-module $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$ as $X = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} X' \\ X_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi$, where $X' = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q'_0,\ \alpha \in Q'_1)$ is a Λ'-module, X_n is an A-module, and $\phi : M \otimes_A X_n \to X'$ is a Λ'-map. The explicit expression of ϕ is given in the proof of Lemma 4.9.

By a direct translation from Lemma 4.7 in this setting-up, we have

Lemma 4.8. *Let $X = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} X' \\ X_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi$ be a Λ-module. Then $X \in \mathcal{GP}(\Lambda)$ if and only if X satisfies the conditions*:

(i) $X_n \in \mathcal{GP}(A)$;

(ii) $\phi : M \otimes_A X_n \longrightarrow X'$ *is an injective Λ'-map*;

(iii) $\mathrm{Coker}\,\phi \in \mathcal{GP}(\Lambda')$.

Theorem 4.1 will be proved by applying Lemma 4.8 and using induction on $|Q_0|$. Thus, in the rest part of this paper we write a Λ-module $X = (X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i \in Q_0,\ \alpha \in Q_1)$ as $X = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} X' \\ X_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi$, and keep all the notations I', Q', Λ', $P(n)$, M, X, X', X_n and ϕ. For an integer $m \geq 0$ and a module N, let N^m denote the direct sum of m copies of N (if $m = 0$ then $N^m := 0$).

Lemma 4.9. *Let $X = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} X' \\ X_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)_\phi$ be a Λ-module. Then*

(1) *$\phi : M \otimes_A X_n \to X'$ is an injective Λ'-map if and only if $\sum\limits_{p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_p = \bigoplus\limits_{p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_p$, and X_p is injective for all $i \in Q'_0$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)$.*

(2) *If X is monic then $\phi : M \otimes_A X_n \to X'$ is injective.*

(3) $\mathrm{Coker}\,\phi = (X_i/(\bigoplus\limits_{p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_p),\ \widetilde{X_\alpha},\ i \in Q'_0,\ \alpha \in Q'_1)$, *where for each $\alpha : j \to i$ in Q'_1,*

$$\widetilde{X_\alpha} : X_j/(\bigoplus_{q \in \mathcal{P}(n \to j)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_q) \to X_i/(\bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_p)$$

is the A-map induced by X_α. Explicitly, $\widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x_j}) = X_\alpha(x_j) + \bigoplus\limits_{p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_p$, where $\overline{x_j} := x_j + \bigoplus\limits_{q \in \mathcal{P}(n \to j)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_q \in X_j/\bigoplus\limits_{q \in \mathcal{P}(n \to j)} \mathrm{Im}\, X_q$.

Proof. (1) For $i \in Q'_0$, put $m_i := |\mathcal{P}(n \to i)|$. As a representation of (Q', I') over k, $\mathrm{rad}P(n)$ can be written as $\begin{pmatrix} k^{m_1} \\ \vdots \\ k^{m_{n-1}} \end{pmatrix}$, so we have isomorphisms of Λ'-modules

$$M \otimes_A X_n \cong (\mathrm{rad}P(n) \otimes_k A) \otimes_A X_n \cong \mathrm{rad}P(n) \otimes_k X_n \cong \begin{pmatrix} X_n^{m_1} \\ \vdots \\ X_n^{m_{n-1}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}(n \to i) = \{p_1, \cdots, p_{m_i}\}$. Then $\phi : M \otimes_A X_n \to X'$ reads

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \phi_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} X_n^{m_1} \\ \vdots \\ X_n^{m_{n-1}} \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_{n-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\phi_i = (X_{p_1}, \cdots, X_{p_{m_i}}) : X_n^{m_i} \to X_i$. So ϕ is injective if and only if ϕ_i is injective for each $i \in Q_0'$; and if and only if $\sum\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p = \bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p$, and X_p is injective for all $p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)$.

(2) By Theorem 2.3(3) $\sum\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p = \bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p$ for all $i \in Q_0'$, and by Theorem 2.3(1) X_p is injective for all $p \in \mathcal{P}(n \to i)$ and $i \in Q_0'$, and hence ϕ is injective by (1).

(3) follows from the proof of (1). ■

4.4. For $i, j \in Q_0'$, we put $\mathcal{P}' := \{\text{path of } Q'\}$, $\mathcal{A}'(\to i) := \{\alpha \in Q_1' \mid e(\alpha) = i\}$, and $\mathcal{P}'(\to i) := \{\ p \in \mathcal{P}' \mid e(p) = i,\ l(p) \geq 1,\ p \notin I'\}$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let* $X = \binom{X'}{X_n}_{\phi}$ *be a monic* Λ*-module satisfying* (G). *Then* $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ *is a monic* Λ'*-module satisfying* (G).

Proof. Claim 1: $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ satisfies (m1), i.e., $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha} = \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}$ for each $i \in Q_0'$.

In fact, let $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)} \widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x_\alpha}) = 0$ with each $x_\alpha \in X_{s(\alpha)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha) \in \bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p &= \sum_{\beta\in\mathcal{A}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta + \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)\setminus\mathcal{A}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p \\ &= \sum_{\beta\in\mathcal{A}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_\beta + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(s(\alpha)\to i)} X_\alpha\Big(\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\notin I}} \operatorname{Im} X_q\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Since $s(\alpha) \neq n$, by (m1) on X we have

$$X_\alpha(x_\alpha) \in X_\alpha\Big(\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\notin I}} \operatorname{Im} X_q\Big) \subseteq \bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)} \operatorname{Im} X_p$$

for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}'(\to i)$. This means $\widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x_\alpha}) = 0$.

Claim 2: $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ satisfies (m2), i.e., $\operatorname{Ker}\widetilde{X_\alpha} = \sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_q}$ for each $\alpha \in Q_1'$.

In fact, clearly $\sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_q} \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}\widetilde{X_\alpha}$. Let $\widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x}) = 0$ with $x \in X_{s(\alpha)}$. Then $X_\alpha(x) \in \bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to e(\alpha))} \operatorname{Im} X_p$. By the similar argument as in Claim 1 we have $X_\alpha(x) \in X_\alpha(\sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\notin I}} \operatorname{Im} X_q)$. By (m2) on X we have in the quotient

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{x} \in \operatorname{Ker}X_\alpha + \bigoplus_{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))} \operatorname{Im} X_q &= \sum_{\substack{q'\in\mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q'\in I}} \operatorname{Im} X_{q'} + \bigoplus_{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))} \operatorname{Im} X_q \\ &= \sum_{\substack{q'\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q'\in I'}} \operatorname{Im} X_{q'} + \bigoplus_{q\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))} \operatorname{Im} X_q.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\overline{x} \in \sum\limits_{\substack{q'\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q'\in I'}} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_{q'}}$. This proves Claim 2.

Claim 3: $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ satisfies (G).

In fact, by Lemma 4.6(2) it suffices to prove $\dfrac{X_i/(\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p)}{\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}}$ is Gorenstein-projective for each $i\in Q_0'$.

Since $\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)\setminus\mathcal{A}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p\subseteq\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}&=\frac{\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha+\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p}{\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p}\\&=\frac{\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha+\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)\setminus\mathcal{A}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p}{\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p}\\&=(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha)/(\bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p)\\&\overset{(\mathrm{m1})}{=}(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha)/(\bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{X_i/(\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p)}{\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}}\cong X_i/(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha)\tag{4.1}$$

which is Gorenstein-projective by (G) on X. ■

4.5. **Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Use induction on $n=|Q_0|$.

We first prove the sufficiency. Assume that $X=(X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i\in Q_0,\ \alpha\in Q_1)=\binom{X'}{X_n}_\phi$ is a monic Λ-module satisfying (G). We need to prove that X is Gorenstein-projective. The assertion clearly holds for $n=1$. Suppose that the assertion holds for $n-1$ $(n\geq 2)$. It suffices to prove that X satisfies the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 4.8. In fact, the condition (i) is contained in the condition (G); and the condition (ii) follows from Lemma 4.9(2). By Lemma 4.10 $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ is a monic Λ'-module satisfying (G). Since $|Q_0'|=n-1$, it follows from induction that $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ is Gorenstein-projective, i.e., the condition (iii) in Lemma 4.8 is also satisfied. This proves that X is Gorenstein-projective.

Now we prove the necessity. Assume that $X=(X_i,\ X_\alpha,\ i\in Q_0,\ \alpha\in Q_1)=\binom{X'}{X_n}_\phi$ is a Gorenstein-projective Λ-module. We need to prove that X is a monic Λ-module satisfying (G). The assertion clearly holds for $n=1$. Suppose that the assertion holds for $n-1$ $(n\geq 2)$. By Lemma 4.8 X_n is a Gorenstein-projective A-module, $\phi:M\otimes_A X_n\to X'$ is an injective Λ'-map, and $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ is a Gorenstein-projective Λ'-module. Since ϕ is injective, by Lemma 4.9(1) we have

(1) For each $i\in Q_0'$ there holds $\sum\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p=\bigoplus\limits_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p$; and

(2) X_p is an injective A-map for $p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)$ and $i\in Q_0'$.

Since $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ is a Gorenstein-projective Λ'-module and $|Q_0'|=n-1$, by induction $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ is a monic Λ'-module satisfying (G). Thus we have

(3) For each $i\in Q_0'$ there holds $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}=\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha}$; and

(4) For each $\alpha\in Q_1'$ there holds $\operatorname{Ker}\widetilde{X_\alpha}=\sum\limits_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_q}$.

Claim 1: X satisfies (m1), i.e., for each $i\in Q_0$ there holds $\sum\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha=\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha$.

In fact, suppose that $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)} X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ with each $x_\alpha\in X_{s(\alpha)}$. Then $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}\widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x_\alpha})=0$. By (3) we have $\widetilde{X_\alpha}(\overline{x_\alpha})=0$ for each $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)$, and hence $\overline{x_\alpha}\in\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_q}$ by (4). So there exists $y_\alpha\in\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}\operatorname{Im}X_q$ such that $x_\alpha-y_\alpha\in\bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))}\operatorname{Im}X_p$. Thus there exists $x'_\alpha=\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))}X_p(x_{p,\alpha})$ with each $x_{p,\alpha}\in X_{s(p)}$ such that $x_\alpha-y_\alpha=x'_\alpha$. Since $X_\alpha X_q=0$ for $\alpha q\in I'$, we have $X_\alpha(y_\alpha)=0$, and hence $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=X_\alpha(x'_\alpha)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(n\to i)}X_\alpha(x_\alpha)+\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}X_\alpha(x_\alpha)\\&=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(n\to i)}X_\alpha(x_\alpha)+\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)}X_\alpha\Big(\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))}X_p(x_{p,\alpha})\Big).\end{aligned}$$

By (1) this sum is a direct sum, hence $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(n\to i)$, and $X_\alpha X_p(x_{p,\alpha})=0$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}'(\to i)$ and $p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))$. Thus all together $X_\alpha(x_\alpha)=0$ for each $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)$. This proves Claim 1.

Claim 2: X satisfies (m2), i.e., for each $\alpha\in Q_1$ there holds $\operatorname{Ker}X_\alpha=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I}}\operatorname{Im}X_q$.

Let $x\in\operatorname{Ker}X_\alpha$. Then $\overline{x}\in\operatorname{Ker}\widetilde{X_\alpha}$. By (4) we have

$$\overline{x}=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}X_q(x_q)+\bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))}\operatorname{Im}X_p$$

for some $x_q\in X_{s(q)}$, and hence there is $y_p\in X_n$ for each $p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}x&=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}X_q(x_q)+\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))}X_p(y_p)\\&=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}X_q(x_q)+\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha p\in I}}X_p(y_p)+\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha p\notin I}}X_p(y_p)\end{aligned}$$

Since $X_\alpha(x)=0$ and $X_\alpha X_q=0$ for $\alpha q\in I$, we have $\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha p\notin I}}X_\alpha X_p(y_p)=0$. By (1) we have $X_\alpha X_p(y_p)=0$ for each $p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))$ with $\alpha p\notin I$. But by (2) $X_\alpha X_p$ is injective, so $y_p=0$ for all $p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))$ with $\alpha p\notin I$. Thus

$$x=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}'(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I'}}X_q(x_q)+\sum_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha p\in I}}X_p(y_p)\in\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathcal{P}(\to s(\alpha))\\ \alpha q\in I}}\operatorname{Im}X_q.$$

This proves Claim 2.

By **Claims 1** and **2** X is a monic Λ-module. It remains to prove that X satisfies (G). By Lemma 4.6(2) it suffices to prove that $X_i/(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha)$ is a Gorenstein-projective A-module for each $i\in Q_0$. We have claimed that $\operatorname{Coker}\phi$ satisfies (G), i.e., for each $i\in Q'_0$, $(X_i/(\bigoplus_{p\in\mathcal{P}(n\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_p))/(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{X_\alpha})$ is a Gorenstein-projective A-module, which is isomorphic to $X_i/(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}(\to i)}\operatorname{Im}X_\alpha)$ by (4.1). This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. ■

References

[1] D. M. Arnold, Abelian groups and representations of finite partially ordered sets, Canad. Math. Soc. Books in Math., Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.

[2] M. Auslander, M. Bridger, Stable module theory, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 94., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1969.
[3] M. Auslander, Representation dimension of artin algebras, Queen Mary College Math. Notes, London, 1971.
[4] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, S. O. Smalø, Representation Theory of Artin Algebras, Cambridge Studies in Adv. Math. 36., Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
[5] L. L. Avramov, A. Martsinkovsky, Absolute, relative, and Tate cohomology of modules of finite Gorenstein dimension, Proc. London Math. Soc. 85(3)(2002), 393-440.
[6] A. Beligiannis, Cohen-Macaulay modules, (co)torsion pairs and virtually Gorenstein algebras, J. Algebra 288(1)(2005), 137-211.
[7] G. Birkhoff, Subgroups of abelian groups, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. II, Ser. 38(1934), 385-401.
[8] R.-O. Buchweitz, Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate cohomology over Gorenstein rings, Unpublished manuscript, Hamburg (1987), 155pp.
[9] R.-O. Buchweitz, G.-M. Greuel, F.-O. Schreyer, Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities II, Invent. Math. 88(1)(1987), 165-182.
[10] X. W. Chen, The stable monomorphism category of a Frobenius category, Math. Res. Lett. 18(1)(2011), 125-137.
[11] L. W. Christensen, A. Frankild, H. Holm, On Gorenstein projective, injective and flat dimensions-a functorial description with applications, J. Algebra 302(1)(2006), 231-279.
[12] L. W. Christensen, G. Piepmeyer, J. Striuli, R. Takahashi, Finite Gorenstein representation type implies simple singularity, Adv. Math. 218(2008), 1012-1026.
[13] E. E. Enochs, O. M. G. Jenda, Gorenstein injective and projective modules, Math. Z. 220(4)(1995), 611-633.
[14] E. E. Enochs, O. M. G. Jenda, Relative homological algebra, De Gruyter Exp. Math. 30. Walter De Gruyter Co., 2000.
[15] D. Happel, Triangulated categories in representation theory of finite dimensional algebras, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Ser. 119, Cambridge Uni. Press, 1988.
[16] D. Happel, On Gorenstein algebras, in: Representation theory of finite groups and finite-dimensional algebras, Prog. Math. 95, 389-404, Birkhaüser, Basel, 1991.
[17] H. Holm, Gorenstein homological dimensions, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 189(1-3)(2004), 167-193.
[18] Z. Y. Huang, Proper resolutions and Gorenstein categories, J. Algebra 393(1)(2013), 142-169.
[19] O. Iyama, K. Kato, J. I. Miyachi, Recollement on homotopy categories and Cohen-Macaulay modules, J.K-Theory 8(3)(2011), 507-541.
[20] P. Jørgensen, Existence of Gorenstein projective resolutions and Tate cohomology, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 9(2007), 59-76.
[21] B. Keller, Chain complexes and stable categories, Manuscripta Math. 67 (1990), 379-417.
[22] H. Knörrer, Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities I, Invent. Math. 88(1)(1987), 153-164.
[23] D. Kussin, H. Lenzing, H. Meltzer, Nilpotent operators and weighted projective lines, J. Reine Angew. Math. 685(6)(2010), 33-71.
[24] D. Kussin, H. Lenzing, H. Meltzer, Triangle singularities, ADE-chains, and weighted projective lines, Adv. Math. 237(2013), 194-251.
[25] X. H. Luo, P. Zhang, Monic representations and Gorenstein-projective modules, Pacific J. Math. 264(1)(2013), 163-194.
[26] A. Moore, The Auslander and Ringel-Tachikawa theorem for submodule embeddings, Comm. Algebra 38(2010), 3805-3820.
[27] D. Quillen, Higher algebraic K-theory I, In: Lecture Notes in Math. 341, 85-147, Springer-Verlag, 1973.
[28] C. M. Ringel, Tame algebras and integral quadratic forms, Lecture Notes in Math. 1099, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
[29] C. M. Ringel, M. Schmidmeier, Submodules categories of wild representation type, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 205(2)(2006), 412-422.
[30] C. M. Ringel, M. Schmidmeier, The Auslander-Reiten translation in submodule categories, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360(2)(2008), 691-716.
[31] C. M. Ringel, M. Schmidmeier, Invariant subspaces of nilpotent operators I, J. rein angew. Math. 614 (2008), 1-52.
[32] S. Sather-Wagstaff, T. Sharif, D. White, Stability of Gorenstein categories, J. London Math. Soc. 77(2) (2008), 481-502.
[33] D. Simson, Representation types of the category of subprojective representations of a finite poset over $K[t]/(t^m)$ and a solution of a Birkhoff type problem, J. Algebra 311(2007), 1-30.
[34] D. Simson, Tame-wild dichotomy of Birkhoff type problems for nilpotent linear operators, J. Algebra 424(2015), 254-293.
[35] P. Zhang, Monomorphism categories, cotilting theory, and Gorenstein-projective modules, J. Algebra 339(2011), 180-202.
[36] P. Zhang, Gorenstein-projective modules and symmetric recollements, J. Algebra 388 (2013), 65-80.

Xiu-Hua Luo, xiuhualuo2014@163.com
Dept. of Math., Nantong Univ., Nantong 226019, China

Pu Zhang, pzhang@sjtu.edu.cn
Dept. of Math., Shanghai Jiao Tong Univ., Shanghai 200240, China